



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

larly of the Imperf., and the analogies and differences between the Assyrian forms and the Hebrew need still further elucidation.

The author's position as to the Passive Part.—its existence as an undeveloped form, is confessedly open to question, but it is certainly a striking fact that not a single assured trace of a Passive Qāl stem, aside from the Passive Part. is to be found in Hebrew.

I am not ready to accept the view that the יִקְטֹל form of the Imperf. is simply a differentiation of a more original יִקְטַל form, nor is the author's account of the origin of Segholates from the qatāl, qatīl and qatūl forms altogether satisfactory. Despite their abstract meaning these forms seem to stand nearer the simple root, and appear more likely to be the first products of speech than are the longer, bivocalic nouns.

But on the whole this essay is a very satisfactory treatment of a neglected department of Hebrew grammar, its method and spirit commend it to the reader, and we welcome all such attempts to shed a clearer light upon special questions of Semitic philology.

A. S. CARRIER.

---

#### THE DIVINE NAME ADONAJ AND ITS HISTORY.\*

---

A critical student of Hebrew philology seldom feels more satisfaction than will be experienced in reading this little book by Dr. Dalman. It is a rigidly scientific and thoroughly exhaustive examination of the word Adonaj, and especially of the obscure history of its substitution for the ancient and peculiarly sacred name of יְהוָה. To this task the author applies a surprising wealth of learning, and an untiring patience in the discovery and investigation of facts. The results also, as may be inferred, are considerably at variance with the hitherto commonly accepted results of a mere superficial study. A statement of the topics considered in the nine chapters will prepare us for a closer survey of the contents: 1. Baal, Adon, Adonaj. 2. Adonaj and Adoni. 3. The suffix of Adonaj. 4. A Survey of the Uses of Adonaj. 5. The Fact of the Substitution of Adonaj for Jahve. 6. Jewish Testimonies to the Uses of the Divine Name. 7. History and Significance of the Transition from Jahve to Adonaj. 8. The Names Lord and Christ. 9. Appendix: The Masora on Adonaj.

From a careful examination of the material at hand, little can be gleaned as to the actual history of אֲדֹנָי. There certainly does not appear to be any progress from a conscious use of the suffix to a meaningless use of the same. Some striking facts are, however, pointed out in connection with its use. "We find it pretty evenly distributed in the historical books, but it occurs only seldom in Ezra-Nehemiah, and not at all in the priestly sources of the Hexateuch, nor in Chronicles and Esther. If we assume Ps. xc. and following to be of later origin, we perceive the same decrease. Pss. i.-xc. have אֲדֹנָי forty-six times, Pss. xc.-cl. only nine times. In the prophets the use of אֲדֹנָי is clearly dependent on individual peculiarity. 1 Isaiah and Amos have it often, their contemporary Hosea not at all, and Micah only twice. In the Chaldean period it is found fre-

---

\* STUDIEN ZUR BIBLISCHEN THEOLOGIE: DER GOTTESNAME ADONAJ UND SEINE GESCHICHTE. Von Gustaf H. Dalman, Ph. D. Berlin: 1890. Pp. 91.

quently in Jeremiah, Ezekiel has it in extraordinary richness, 2 Isaiah less often, and Habakkuk and Zephaniah not at all. After the exile neither 1 Zechariah nor Haggai employ it, and Malachi only twice in passages probably emended. It is a remarkable fact that the very prophets who tell of a personal commission, a call of God to them, i. e., 1 Isaiah (vii. 9), Amos (vii. 15), Jeremiah (i. 10), Ezekiel (ii. 3), 2 Isaiah (xlviii. 16; l. 4), by preference use אֲדֹנָי, for which no other reason can be assigned than that the relation in which they stood to Yahweh was especially personal. At that time the suffix of אֲדֹנָי was certainly not meaningless."

It is certain, however, that in the time of Christ the force of the suffix had been effectively worn away, for אֲדֹנָי was employed in common oral usage as a substitute for יְהוָה. This substitution, which had taken place so thoroughly that no remembrance remained of an earlier use of יְהוָה, had probably been completed when the Greek translation of the Pentateuch was made. As to the nature of the transformations which took place in the time between Ezra-Nehemiah and the Maccabees, the Jews in Christ's time were wholly in the dark. Everything dating from that period they were disposed to regard as antique.

No express biblical reason for this long-established popular disuse of the name יְהוָה is found. A careful sifting of Jewish testimonies reveals, however, that this dread of uttering the divine name was common to the Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism, and that it attached itself especially to Ex. xx. 7. If this commandment not to "take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" be understood of a mere utterance of the divine name, then there was abundant reason to dread the threatened penalty as well as the curses pronounced in Deut. xxviii. 59 sq. This שֵׁם יְהוָה was peculiar to Israel's God. It was the self-designation which separated him from all other beings, and which in an extraordinary manner he made representative of himself. The temple, above every other consideration, was the place to which he had attached his name. He leads the Psalmist into paths of righteousness "for his name's sake" (Ps. cxiii. 3). His people tread their enemies under foot "through his name" (Ps. xlv. 6). We find even an independent punitive activity attached to it (Isa. xxx. 27). The name יְהוָה was therefore pre-eminently holy. But "within the limits of the Priest-Code holiness means nothing else than separation. The fundamental idea in all the regulations of this Code is that just as nothing "common" i. e., belonging to the ordinary, secular life should come into holy use, so nothing holy should come into secular use. As rigidly as Israel by reason of its separation from the nations was to hold itself apart from them, so rigidly within Israel everything belonging to Yahweh was to be divided off from that which was not God's especial possession." Yahweh's name would, of course, be one of the first to fall within this category of things excluded from common use. "The time of the Mishnaic command to 'make a hedge about the Law' was about contemporary with the period when it was sought to protect the name יְהוָה from profanation by a prohibition of its use. The *non-utterance* of יְהוָה, which it was thought would make a desecration of this divine name impossible, was a *hedge of rabbinical solicitude* for the fulfilment of the command in Ex. xx. 7."

Two substitutes for this holy name offered themselves, both of which had corresponding terms in Aramaic and Greek, viz., אֱלֹהִים and אֲדֹנָי. Only the latter could be employed since it was the name which bound him who used it to

the service of Yahweh. Anyone of the heathen could say אֱלֹהִים, but only one who recognized the supremacy of Yahweh would call him אֲדֹנָי. At the same time the suffix lost its force, since the emphasis lay, not on a personal relation to God, but on his Lordship.

An examination of the later portion of Hebrew literature with respect to this suppression of the divine name exhibits some very remarkable results, and seems to warrant the inference that the movement began about the third century B. C., and became a complete fact a century later.

The fact itself was of deep significance as a preparation for Christianity, for with the introduction of the name אֲדֹנָי Israel's God began his triumphant march among the nations as the Lord of the world. It comes to us in the corresponding Greek form *κύριος*, the full significance of which passed over to him who at the close of the Old Covenant made God comprehensible to humanity, and in whom the fullness of the Godhead took living form. "The divine name Adonaj contains therefore germinally the final goal of all history, the union of a collected humanity under one head—Christ."

Such are the main results of this painstaking investigation of all the available facts bearing on the meaning and use of this divine name. Passing all minor criticisms, we are confident that in the main the author has successfully refuted the prevailing notion that the Jewish dread of pronouncing the name יְהוָה rests upon a mere mistranslation in the LXX, of Lev. xxiv. 16. The cause lies far deeper than this. It is traceable to that extraordinary degeneracy of the Mosaic religion into rabbinical Judaism which annihilated the free and lofty spirit of the Law beneath a grinding bondage of the latter.

PHILIP A. NORDELL.

---

### SEMITIC RELIGION.\*

---

The new book of Prof. W. Robertson Smith is one of the series of Burnett lectures. Three series are contemplated on the same subject, to-wit: The Primitive Religions of the Semitic Peoples viewed in relation to other ancient religions and to the spiritual religion of the Old Testament and of Christianity. The inquiry is a proper one. For the revelation of the Old Testament was built upon some sort of foundation already in existence, and it is quite certain that the first stones of this foundation were already laid when the Semites [why not *Shemites*?] existed as one people. That this primitive religion existed longest among the Arabs is altogether likely. To a certain extent the present book covers the same ground with Wellhausen's *Reste Arabischen Heidenthums*, to which indeed the author makes frequent reference. It covers broader ground than that book, however, and the criticism likely to be made is that the ground covered is too broad. In some portions the preliminary work is not yet done. The Assyrian and Babylonian religion is indeed excluded as having lost the primitive Semitic features.

The plan of the work is as follows: After an introductory chapter defining the subject and the method of inquiry the author takes up "The Nature of the

---

\* LECTURES ON THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES. First Series, the Fundamental Institutions. By W. Robertson Smith, M. A., LL. D., Fellow of Christ's College and Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889 (xii and 488 pages).